



Continuity of Operations Planning System

Post-Implementation Report

Prepared by: Janell Quinlan

Version: [Final](#)

Date of publication: [09/30/05](#)

Post-Implementation Report

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Name: Continuity of Operations Planning System

Date: September 30, 2005

Project Sponsor: Risk Management

Project Manager: Janell Quinlan

Report Prepared By: Janell Quinlan

CATEGORIES: Categories of the report correspond to the categories in the Post-Project Survey. For each category, the Overall Rating is the average of the ratings provided on completed survey forms for that category (1= Poor, 2= Fair 3= Satisfactory, 4= Good, 5= Excellent)

A. PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

Initially, the project scope was reported as being continuity of planning for the most critical government services to expand to include local and tribal government. After reevaluating the process, the COG Team refined the scope for this project to meet the software needs of the state agencies for developing their continuity of operations plans. The Continuity of Operations Plan program will continue to expand as needs of agencies and laws are identified and change with the goal to include local and tribal government.

The Governor's Continuum of Government (COG) Team saw the need to develop uniformity and consistency between state agencies' Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP). After reviewing the different software proposals submitted as part of the RFP process, the Strohl Systems Living Disaster Recovery Planning System (LDRPS) was chosen.

This software achieved the following assessment performance metrics:

- All agencies have access to the software to achieve a standardized planning capability resulting in all state agencies having the same components to their plans.
- Employee, vendor and asset information for each state agency has been imported from ConnectND.
- A maintainable central plan repository (a single database) for state entities that is globally accessible via the Internet and hosted at Information Technology Department (ITD) has been created.
- Continuity of operations plans for state agencies developed and stored on the COG server.

This software also gave the COG Team the capability to run information based on a facility location. This enables them to gather information for all agencies located there and not just by each agency.

Additional benefits of this project are in the following areas of Information Technology (IT):

- Assist agencies in identifying which IT equipment is considered essential within twenty-four hours, vital within seventy-two hours and which can wait longer to be restored.
- Assist agencies in understanding how to contact Information Technology Department (ITD) for assistance in restoration.
- Assist ITD in prioritizing which IT systems and agencies need to be restored in what order.

The chances of success for this project were high. State agencies embraced this project as something that is a benefit to them. Some agencies had experience in past disasters in the state that had shown them that they weren't as prepared as they should have been. Other agencies observing what those agencies went through realize that it could be them the next time and wanted to ensure that they are ready to respond.

Having an identified project manager that assisted agencies through the process helped ensure success of this project. Also having a working group to do the unique customizing enabled them to serve as mentors to the other agencies, which increased the success of the project.

Overall Survey Rating: 3.635 Satisfactory

B. CSSQ MANAGEMENT

Cost:

Initially, there was no designated budget for this project. The funding for this project came from multiple sources. The Project Chair and Manager were able to obtain two Homeland Security Grants to assist in purchasing, hosting, and maintaining software along with training. The agencies had to incur expenses to develop their plans.

The following documents the budget and actual costs.

Element	<u>Amount Budgeted</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>
Equipment	\$ 17,495.62	\$ 17,375.42
Software	\$250,754.38	\$250,861.21
Training	\$202,438.44	\$202,438.44
Total	<u>\$470,688.44</u>	<u>\$470,675.07</u>

From the figures presented it appears that the software went over budget. Because the grant was written for equipment and software, we were able to use some of the equipment dollars to pay the software costs and still stay on budget. After the adjustment, the equipment budget came in \$13.37 under budget.

The Project Manager negotiated with Strohl Systems for trainers and Bismarck State College Corporation and Continuing Program for computer lab usage for a better rate because of doing multiple classes. Consequently, money was saved on the training that would have brought the training part of project in under budget. The decision was made to take those extra dollars to implement a training maintenance contract with Strohl Systems to address the future training needs as agencies change personnel.

Schedule:

The schedule was impacted by a lack of designated full time staff to see to the development and implementation of this project. The Governor's appointed COG Team members had to assign staff to work on this project.

The deadline for customizing of the software was 9-30-2004. However, the schedule was impacted by the complexities encountered in finalizing several interfaces between the Strohl's software and ConnectND in order to gain access to employee, vendor, and asset data.

Initially, during the Fall of 2003, there were some problems with the software that were worked out with the Strohl Systems Development Staff. In February of 2004, an upgrade of LDRPS was installed, which resulted in a loss of data and subsequently a schedule slippage. The Strohl Systems Development Staff helped to identify and correct the problem. Customizing of the screens for the vendors was completed by November 2004 but the assets were not completed until June 2005 due to additional interface issues between the two software systems. Recognized issues included; high number of vendors to be entered manually, multiple asset management systems in use throughout the state, and agency naming/numbering conventions. However, the added value of importing employee, vendor, and asset information from ConnectND made it necessary for the COG Team to extend the schedule to develop proper interfaces between the two software systems.

The timetable for State Agencies being trained on the software was conducted on schedule from 11-7-03 through 4-16-04. Because of doing multiple courses, the Project Manager was able to negotiate a lower rate saving money on the training. This saving allowed the Project Manager to conduct refresher training from June – October 2004 for agencies to acquaint them with the customization that took place on the software that wasn't available at the time of the training. There were still funds left that enabled additional training to be scheduled from July – October 2005 allowing agencies the opportunity to train more personnel in their agency.

Scope:

The project scope was split into the following in scope and out of scope, which have been addressed.

In Scope

- The COG Team will choose a software package to computerize and integrate plans for easier access to information.
- The Project Work Group will customize software for consistency of information within state agencies and ease of development.
- The COG/COOP Project Manager will set up training for agencies in the use of software.
- The software will be web based for easier access by all state agencies.
- State agencies will complete continuity of operations plans using software.
- An up to date COOP will be a requirement to qualify for the discount on an agency's contribution to the Risk Management Fund based on compliance audits of programs.

Out of Scope

- The COG Team will develop criteria for prioritization of recovery of the IT systems.
- The COG Team will identify critical assets and resources that will need to be restored during pre-determined time frames.

Scope Changes

The project scope listed in the first quarterly report for this project was reported as the following scope: The main goal of the project is the creation of a sound planning system to be implemented at all levels of state, local and tribal governments as well as key private entities that possess key assets and critical infrastructure. The initial scope of the project, once the overall system template is completed, will be continuity of operations planning for the most critical government services. Upon substantial completion of that goal, the implementation model, once accepted by local officials, will be duplicated at the local and tribal level.

To meet the information technology large project requirements, the project scope listed in the first quarterly report was narrowed to the software needs of state agencies for developing their continuity of operation plans. The COG Team approved this change in scope.

Quality:

In this project, Quality Control was monitored by the Project Manager to determine if the expectations of project stakeholders were met. This was done by email, phone and office visits with COOP Administrators. Also, the Project Manager reviewing the completed project deliverables with the Project Work Group, Project Pilot Team and/or COG Team accomplished this quality control.

One way that Quality Assurance was performed was having the Test Agencies Group check out the customization. Quality audits were conducted by the Project Manager through status reports by COOP Administrators, assisting agencies with plan

development, reviewing plans in LDRPS and correspondence and visits with agencies. This was necessary to provide an ongoing effort of reviewing project quality, and to identify areas of Quality Improvement.

Quality Improvement actions to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the project were based on recommendations by the Project Work Group and agencies to provide added benefits to the project stakeholders. In most cases, implementing quality improvements required the Project Manager or some other member of the Project Work Group to take appropriate corrective actions.

Overall Survey Rating: 3.877 Satisfactory

C. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risks for the Continuity of Operations Planning System Project and the actions to be taken are listed below:

	Risk	Risk Assignment	Risk Response Plan	Actions Taken
1	Software deficiencies affecting customizing.	Project Work Group	Work with Strohl Systems to identify problem and implement patch.	Worked with Strohl Systems Help Desk and Developers.
2	System Integration with PeopleSoft fails or becomes ineffective.	Project Work Group/IT System Administration Group	Work with the ConnectND developers and Strohl Systems to ensure everything is technically in place for accurate importing.	Worked with ConnectND staff and Strohl Systems Help Desk to complete imports.
3	Delayed release of the LDRPS web version hinders the access for some state agencies that are outside the state network's firewalls.	Project Work Group/IT System Administration	Identify alternate methods of accessing the LAN and work with Strohl Systems to install web version upon release.	Strohl Systems released the Web version of LDRPS in November 03 enabling all state agencies that have received training to access the LDRPS.

Overall Survey Rating: 3.815 Satisfactory

D. COMMUNICATIONS

The roles for communications were assigned to the following positions.

Description of Communication	To Whom / Stakeholders Involved	Frequency	Facilitator (s)
Project Pilot Team Meetings	Project Pilot Team	Initially on a weekly basis and then as needed	Project Manager
COG Meeting	COG Team	At least quarterly, more often if issues require it	COG Chairperson
Project Status Review Meetings	Project Work Group and COG Chairperson	Weekly and more often if issues require it	Project Work Group and COG Chairperson
Project Status Reports	Governor, COG Team, Project Pilot Team, State Agencies, IT Legislative Committee	At least quarterly, more often if issues require it	Project Manager and COG Chairperson
Strohl Systems Implementation Assistance Conference Calls	Project Work Group and COG Chairperson	As issues require	Project Work Group and COG Chairperson
Strohl's User Group Meetings and Email Bulletins	Project Work Group and COG Chairperson	09/27/03-10/01/03 and TBD	Project Work Group and COG Chairperson

The Project Work Group started doing conference calls in February 2004 with the States of Arkansas and Louisiana who were also using LDRPS to develop COOP for state agencies. These calls were used to discuss customizing issues, plan formats and policies. These calls are conducted every month to six weeks depending on the schedule of the participants. The State of Georgia started participating in 2005.

Risk Managers and COOP Administrators for agencies were invited to the '03, '04, and '05 Risk Management Seminars. Members of the Project Work Group presented information on status and upcoming activities of the project.

Members of the Project Work Group attended the '03 and '04 Strohl Systems User Conference to learn ways that other users had customized and used LDRPS and other Strohl products. This was valuable training for the members in developing this project.

Lessons Learned:

The Project Work Group did not have enough experience in customizing software to know how much time to factor into the schedule for unseen problems. Consequently, the training schedule got ahead of the customizing schedule. The group learned not to start scheduling training until customized software is ready to go into the test mode.

Another lesson was that the project could have worked at a faster more efficient level if there would have been more full time staff devoted to it. At a minimum, there should have been a person to oversee the customizing while the other person was devoted to managing the other aspects of the project.

Some agencies indicated in the survey that they learned that they weren't as prepared as they thought and the importance for this type of planning. This helped them see the importance of preplanning and planning for the unforeseeable events along with how detailed it needed to be to recover and function adequately. It also was noted that what worked for one agency didn't necessary mean it works for another agency so they came to understand why customizing had to be done and adjustments had to be made to accommodate the needs of agencies.

Others learned that collaboration was needed, that this was not a project that one person should do but required information from staff throughout the agency. This collaboration worked better if the executive level of the agencies gave attention to it and directives to staff.

Overall Survey Rating: 4.018 Good

E. ACCEPTANCE MANAGEMENT

The following chart shows the activities and deliverables for the project.

	Completion Date	Activities	Deliverables
	March 25, 2003		RFP Review Team recommendation of software application acquisition and adopted by COG Team
	April 23-24, 2003	Staff from DEM and RM trained on LDRPS in PA	
	April 30, 2003	LDRPS demonstration and COOP process explained at Risk Management Seminar	
	June 4 – July 16, 2003	Project Pilot Team met weekly to share ideas for customization	
	July 14-15, 2003	Project Work Group received Superuser training on LDRPS	
	July 22-25, 2003	Project Work Group met with Strohl's consultant to get info on customizing	
	July 28 – Aug. 1, 2003	Project Pilot Team trained on LDRPS	
	July 18, 2003		COG Website went on line
	September /November 2003		ITD ordered and installed COG server
	December 2003		Installed web version of software on COG server
	November 2003 – April 2004	Monthly training for state agencies	
	April 2004	Test agencies inputted data to test out the customizing	
	May 2004	Project Work Group made changes based on Test Agencies recommendations	
	June – October 2004	Project Manager conducted Refresher Sessions	
	July 2004	Started importing employees from ConnectND to LDRPS every two weeks	
	November 30, 2004		COOP first drafts completed by state agencies except assets
	March 2005	Importing vendors from ConnectND to LDRPS	
	June 2005	Importing assets from ConnectND to LDRPS	
	June 30, 2005		Software customized for agencies to complete plans

Overall Survey Rating: 3.545 Satisfactory

F. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT

It was determined that a project manager was needed to oversee this project with the multitude of agencies involved. The position of ND COG/COOP Project Manager was developed. It was decided that DEM would provide a staff member to serve as the project manager to see that the directives of the COG Team were met. This person worked with the Strohl Systems staff, state agencies, set up training, developed reports, kept project and budget on schedule and provided supervision of the Project Work Group and Project Pilot Team.

It was necessary to have a project pilot team that could offer information on what the special needs of agencies were so those needs could be addressed in customized software. The project pilot team was made up of seventeen small and large state agencies that had some unique requirements or concerns in the areas of financial expertise, legal, security, infrastructure, public services, equipment, IT, elected and appointed personnel.

It was determined that the Project Manager needed a working group to assist with the customizing of the software. Staff was assigned to this group from DOT, IT, and RM.

A Test Agency Group was developed to test the customized software before making it available to agencies and to work out any problems. The group was made up of members of the Project Work Group, agencies that volunteered or were asked by the Project Manager. The group made recommendations to the Project Work Group that made changes to the software before releasing to the rest of the agencies.

Each state agency was responsible to identify personnel to serve as LDRPS System Administrator(s) for their agency. These people served as contacts with the Project Manager to identify training needs. These people were tasked with working with the appropriate people in their agency to determine security and access issues and ensure that the deadlines for completion were met for their agency.

Various methods were used by agencies to manage their plans. Each agency appointed at least one COOP Administrator. Some of the larger agencies appointed more than one person. In the smaller agencies, the plan was mainly developed by the COOP Administrator collecting data from other staff members. In larger agencies, it was done by a team approach or survey to gather the information needed to be inputted into the software. One person in the some agencies did the data entry into the software, while other agencies used multiple people to do the inputting.

Over the course of the project, some agencies lost personnel trained in use of the software. The Project Manager then worked with newly appointed COOP Administrators

by signing them up for on line training through Strohl Systems and/or personal office visit.

See Appendix A for how agencies were involved in this project.

Overall Survey Rating: 3.38 Satisfactory

G. ISSUES MANAGEMENT

Customizing issues were dealt with by the Project Work Group in consultation with the COG Team Chairperson and reported at the quarterly meetings of the COG Team. A log of email correspondence tracked these customizing issues.

Agencies that had issues with how to use the software contacted the Project Manager by email or phone. The Project Manager worked with that agency by answering questions through those methods or by making office visits. Those issues that were beyond the Project Manager's capability were worked out with the Project Work Group and the Strohl Systems' Help Desk.

Issues and solutions were relayed by email to COOP Administrators.

Issues that affected budget and project deadlines were reported to the COG Team and then voted on by the team.

Using these methods to manage issues worked effectively for issues that were within the COG Team's control to enable them to keep the project within the budget. The issues with the change in ConnectND schedules were beyond the team's control so the team adjusted by voting on change in deadlines for the project.

Overall Survey Rating: 4.126 Good

H. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND TRANSITION

When customizing issues delayed the availability of the software to agencies after training, the Project Manager conducted Refresher Sessions so that agencies could understand the customizing that had taken place and have the opportunity to ask questions. Also COOP Administrators were eligible to sign up for access to on-line training through the Strohl Systems to have access to LDRPS training in case they forgot how to do something. Also the Project Manager was available by phone, email and made office visits to assist agencies in getting plans developed.

Overall Survey Rating: 3.522 Satisfactory

I. PERFORMANCE OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

This project was a statewide enterprise initiative. Therefore, the COG Team served as the Performing Organization with Risk Management as the Chair of the team taking on the more daily supervisory role in conjunction with the Project Manager. Risk Management had two staff members serve on the Project Work Group to assist them in the long term over site of this project.

Overall Survey Rating: 3.63 Satisfactory

J. PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT TEAM

The Project Work Group was the more day-to-day group for this project. This team was made up of the Project Manager who was the only full time person on this project. Other members that had this as supplemental work to their regular job were one representative from ITD, one from DOT and two representatives from Risk Management. The responsibility of this group was to customize the software, set up security for accessing the software over the web, work out issues with ConnectND staff and Strohl Systems staff and importing of information from ConnectND into LDRPS. People that were involved in other software customizing projects informed the Project Manager that this was an aggressive schedule. They were amazed with what was accomplished in the amount of time with such a part time staff.

Overall Survey Rating: 4.266 Good

K. SUCCESS STORIES

The capability to work out the differences between the ConnectND and the LDRPS systems was one successful component of this project.

By integrating data from ConnectND, the agency COOP plan data is current. Agencies are appreciative of not having to enter the employees, vendors, and assets data into two different systems.

The process has enabled agencies to prioritize functions and identify equipment required to support essential functions.

Some agencies have indicated that the ability to learn the attributes of their employees has helped them to learn more about their employees and develop resources for more than just this project.

Agencies indicated that having the support of a Project Manager to work through issues was a valuable resource for them.

APPENDIX A

The following is ways that people were organized for the project.

Groups	Agencies	How are they affected, or how are they participated?
ND COG Team	Office of the Governor, DEM, DOH, Facility Management, Highway Patrol (HP), ITD	Served as the team that oversees the process of COG with Risk Management as chair.
Oversight Analyst	ITD	Reviewed project for consistency with enterprise architecture, compliance with IT standards and timeliness with project schedule.
Project Sponsor	RM	As chair of the COG Team served as the sponsor agency for the project.
ND COG/COOP Project Manager	DEM	Provided a staff member to serve as the project manager to see that the directives of the COG Team were met.
Project Pilot Team	AG, Bank of ND, DEM, DOH, DOT, Department of Humans Service, HP, ITD, National Guard, Office of the Governor, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), RM, State Radio, State Water Commission (SWC), University System (NDSU & UND), WSI	Met weekly in June – July 2003 and contributed the types of information needed by agencies in the COOP process. Also served as the trial group to work out the deficiencies in the prototype.
Project Work Group	DEM, DOH, ITD, RM	Staff from these agencies did the actual customization of the software.
RFP Review Team	DOH, DOT, ITD, RM, WSI	Reviewed the software proposals that companies submitted and gave recommendation to COG Team.
Asset Development Team	AG, Bank of ND, DEM, DOT, HP, ITD, OMB, RM, SWC	Sub-group that was formed from the Project Pilot Team to explore and decide how asset should be handled.
State Agencies	All State Agencies	Agencies developed a continuity of operations plan.